



Office of Program Review & Assessment
400 Hal Greer Boulevard
Huntington, West Virginia 25755-2003
304/696-2494 Fax: 304/696-6612

2002

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Ron Childress, Dean, Graduate School of Education and Professional Development
FROM: Bob Edmunds, Coordinator for Program Review and Assessment
DATE: August 28, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'RBE', is written over the 'FROM' line of the memorandum.

SUBJECT: Review of Yearly Assessment Report
PROGRAM: EdS Education

1. Thanks for submitting the yearly assessment report for EdS Education. Your report has been reviewed by members of the University Assessment Committee. What follows is a brief summary of the reviewers' comments as well as some suggestions for the program to consider as it begins its assessment work for 2003-2004.
2. Guidelines for Yearly Assessment Reports:
 1. Program Goals: The Program Goals were well stated.
 2. Learning Outcomes and Data Collection: Outcomes are stated; however, no specific data was recorded.
 3. Results: Conclusions drawn, but no specific results listed.
 4. Assessment Chart: An assessment chart was present. In future reports please be more specific with the results/analysis column. Indicate the number of candidates and identifying scores along with a brief analysis. Also, when warranted, provide more specific comments in the action taken column. This is where the reviewers judge the feedback loop and its effectiveness.
 5. BOT Initiative #3: Not applicable to graduate programs.
 6. Plans for the current year: Well stated. Good luck with the NCATE visit.
 7. Assistance needed: Noted.
 8. Lessons learned: Well stated.
3. The feedback loop from data collection, analysis and interpretation to the addressed faculty will be important in future reports. Specific changes in the courses, program, requirements, etc., should be well documented. Programmatic changes should be based

C:\2003-2004 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT\EDS EDUCATION.DOC

upon careful examination of the data presented.

4. **Primary Traits Analysis:** As a part of our ongoing accreditation process with NCA/Higher Learning Commission, UAC has completed a chart identified as Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level. This is based on the student academic achievement assessment levels of implementation. Here is the committee's perception of the program's Efficacy of Assessment:

1. Learning Objectives: Level 2
2. Assessment Measures: Level 2
3. Feedback Loop: Level 1

Overall Score: 5.7

Range:

Level One: Beginning Implementation of Assessment Programs	1-3
Level Two: Making Progress in Implementing Assessment Programs	4-6
Level Three: Maturing Stages of Continuous Improvement	7-9

The reviewers have scored the program a 5.7 which places the program at the upper middle section of Level Two: Making Progress in Implementing Assessment Programs. Uppermost in the minds of the reviewers were the specific assessment tools other than PRAXIS II and the written comprehensives. Moreover, document the changes made in the program as a result of the assessment efforts. The program has a number of changes in the works, so careful documentation of these changes will be useful in further reports.

5. Since this program has a number of separate emphases it may be difficult to track all candidates in the program; however, the program may wish to track perhaps 2 emphases each year in its assessment efforts. This will make documentation easier. That is, unless NCATE wishes something else.
6. Of primary concern is data collection and analysis, and specific action taken. NCA wants programs to make sure that assessment evidence is used in making programmatic decisions.
7. Thank you for your report. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact this office.

**Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports
Report for the Academic Year 2001-2002**

Program: EAS EDUCATION

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	Well stated
b. Learning outcomes data collection	OK - some are difficult to measure
c. Results	Conclusions drawn - no specific evidence
(Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/ the appropriate assessment tools/ standards/results/actions taken.)	Yes <u> / </u> No <u> </u> Be more specific w/ results/ analysis - How many people included? - Specific action
II. BOT Initiative #3 (<u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) _____
III. Plans for current Year	Well stated
IV. Assistance needed	noted
V. Most important thing learned through this process	- Well stated

Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level

EDS EDUCATION

Marshall University

PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS

NCA Levels of Implementation Academic Year 2002

DATE: Summer 2003

1. Learning Objectives

Level 0

No objectives were provided.

Level 1

Learning objectives were identified.

Level 2

- Learning objectives were identified.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.

Level 3

- Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.
- They are measurable.
- They support Marshall's educational goals.
- They span multiple learning domains.

2. Assessment Measures

Level 0

No measures were identified.

Level 1

Measures were identified.

Level 2

- Measures were identified.
- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They include direct measures of student learning.

Level 3

- Measures were identified.
- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.

They are multiple.

They emphasize direct learning.

They focus on real-world tasks.

They stress higher order learning.

They are integrated in the curriculum.

They allow performance to be gauged over time.

3. Feedback Loop

Level 0

The feedback loop was not described.

Level 1

- Some data are being collected but not interpreted or not used.
- No performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.

Level 2

- Data are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Data are being shared by other appropriate constituents.
- Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

Level 3

- Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.
- Data are being shared with other appropriate constituents.
- Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.
- The improvement of student learning is central to the department.
- Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.

**Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports
Report for the Academic Year 2001-2002**

Program: EdS in Education

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	report author misunderstood this item; info actually is in IB
b. Learning outcomes data collection	only PRAXIS II, performance assessment seen relevant
c. Results	
(Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/ the appropriate assessment tools/ standards/results/actions taken.)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> re #4: it's not clear how GPA measures <u>contextualization</u> outcome
II. BOT Initiative #3 (Undergraduate Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.)
III. Plans for current Year	concrete
IV. Assistance needed	essentially, none!
V. Most important thing learned through this process	valuable insight

Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level

EdS in Education

Marshall University

PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS

NCA Levels of Implementation 2002-2003

DATE: 3-28-03

1. Learning Objectives

Level 0

No objectives were provided.

Level 1

Learning objectives were identified.

Level 2

- Learning objectives were identified.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.

Level 3

- Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.
- They are measurable.
- They support Marshall's educational goals.
- They span multiple learning domains.

2. Assessment Measures

Level 0

No measures were identified.

Level 1

Measures were identified.

Level 2

- Measures were identified.
- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They include direct measures of student learning.

Level 3

- Measures were identified.
- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.

They are multiple.

They emphasize direct learning.

They focus on real-world tasks.

They stress higher order learning.

They are integrated in the curriculum.

They allow performance to be gauged over time.

3. Feedback Loop

Level 0

The feedback loop was not described.

Level 1

- Some data are being collected but not interpreted or not used.
- No performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.

Level 2

- Data are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Data are being shared by other appropriate constituents.
- Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

Level 3

- Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.
- Data are being shared with other appropriate constituents.
- Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.
- The improvement of student learning is central to the department.
- Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.

**Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports
Report for the Academic Year 2001-2002**

Program: Ed S in Education

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	good
b. Learning outcomes data collection	good
c. Results	good
(Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/ the appropriate assessment tools/ standards/results/actions taken.)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
II. BOT Initiative #3 (<u>Undergraduate Programs Only.</u>)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) N/A
III. Plans for current Year	good
IV. Assistance needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. Most important thing learned through this process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Marshall University
PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS
NCA Levels of Implementation 2002-2003

DATE: 3/13/03

1. Learning Objectives

Level 0

No objectives were provided.

Level 1

Learning objectives were identified.

Level 2

- Learning objectives were identified.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.

Level 3

- Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.
- They are measurable.
- They support Marshall's educational goals.
- They span multiple learning domains.

2. Assessment Measures

Level 0

No measures were identified.

Level 1

Measures were identified.

Level 2

- Measures were identified.
- They relate to the learning objectives
- They include direct measures of student learning.

Level 3

- Measures were identified.
- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.

- They are multiple.
- They emphasize direct learning.
- They focus on real-world tasks.
- They stress higher order learning.
- They are integrated in the curriculum.
- They allow performance to be gauged over time.

3. Feedback Loop

Level 0

The feedback loop was not described.

Level 1

- Some data are being collected but not interpreted or not used.
- No performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.

Level 2

- Data are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Data are being shared by other appropriate constituents.
- Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

Level 3

- Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.
- Data are being shared with other appropriate constituents.
- Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.
- The improvement of student learning is central to the department.
- Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.

December 3, 2002

Education Specialist (EdS) in Education
Graduate Program Assessment
2002 Annual Report

Submitted By: Ron Childress, Dean
Graduate School of Education
and Professional Development

The Educational Specialist degree in Education (EdS) is an umbrella degree designed to provide a planned program of individualized post-master's study for education students. The degree program includes areas of emphasis in Adult and Technical Education, Community College Teaching, Counseling, Curriculum and Instruction, Leadership Studies, and Reading Education. Students enrolling in the Leadership Studies area of emphasis select a concentration in Supervisor of Instruction, Superintendency, or Higher Education Administration.

Considering the individualized nature of the program, its overarching purpose is to assist students in accomplishing one or more of the following personal and professional goals:

- to develop intellectually beyond the Master's level
- to develop advanced professional skills
- to prepare for a new area of professional expertise
- to structure coherent programs of study in pursuit of advanced salary classification rather than have students taking random post-master's courses
- to undertake course work in preparation for doctoral study or research

The faculty in these six areas of emphasis work with individual students to design programs of study that are coherent and consistent with students' personal and professional goals. This work reflects Marshall University's second major commitment: to enhance graduate education. To a lesser extent, it also reflects the third commitment: to expand the body of human knowledge and achievement through research and creative arts activities. In reflecting these commitments, the Education Specialist Program in Education is consistent with Marshall University's mission.

I. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

A. Program Goals

1. Continue to revise and refine program areas of emphasis
2. Develop a common core of courses that will support more than one area of emphasis
3. Develop new areas of emphasis in Instructional Technology and Special Education
4. Continue to develop/refine assessment plan
5. Prepare program for NCATE review in Fall 2002
6. Develop expanded database to support program planning and management
7. Expand program marketing efforts

Progress has been made in Goals 1, 2, and 3. We hope to submit revisions for approval by February, 2003. Progress has been made in Goals 4 and 6, and work is in progress on Goal 5.

Program demand remained strong as 37 students applied and 32 new students were admitted to the program during 2001-2002. One hundred and four students have been admitted in the last four years. Likewise, 19 students received EdS degrees during the past year, 2001-2002. The program produced a record 21 graduates in 2001-02, 11 graduates in 1999-2000, 7 graduates in 1998-1999, and 10 graduates in 1997-1998.

B. Student Assessment

Students completing the EdS Program in Education should be able to:

- Think critically, logically, and creatively about their areas of specialized study
- Communicate, both orally and in writing, with a high degree of clarity and sophistication with regard to intent, audience, and style
- Critically assess the relationship between theory and practice in a selected area of emphasis
- Contextualize their areas of emphasis in terms of historical, economic, social, and political trends
- Engage routinely in inquiry that is systematic, attends to relevant theory, and has practical ramifications.

The stated student objectives for the Education Specialist Program continued to provide direction for program instruction during the past year.

ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES/INSTRUMENTS

The Educational Specialist in Education Program engages in regular and systematic evaluation activities relative to expected student outcomes using multiple evaluation techniques and data sources. These strategies are described in detail in the following paragraphs:

Annual Reports. The West Virginia Department of Education and NCATE require annual evaluation

and progress reports.

Annual Faculty Review/Report. Each full-time member is required to submit an annual report of activities and accomplishments. This report addresses the three main areas of faculty responsibility and includes a component requiring the development of a workplan for the following year.

Content Specialization Test Results (PRAXIS II). An increasingly important element of unit/program evaluation efforts is student performance on the West Virginia Board of Education mandated Praxis II test. All students admitted to professional education programs in West Virginia after September 1, 1985, must pass a test in their area of specialization to be eligible for licensure in West Virginia. In those areas where a sufficient number of test scores are available, program faculty review test results for any program or course implications.

Class Performance – GPA. All Educational Specialist students are monitored in terms of their course performance while in the program. Students are required to maintain a 3.0 GPA or are placed on academic probation.

Educational Personnel Preparation Advisory Committee (EPPAC). The EPPAC is the primary external advisory committee for professional education. The group is composed of representatives from each of the sixteen counties in the service region and includes representatives from each of the role groups for which the unit prepares professional education personnel. A faculty member from each program area also serves on the committee, as does a representative from the West Virginia Department of Education. This group reviews and provides recommendations on new programs, program modifications, results from unit content specialization tests as well as other related issues.

Employer follow-up Studies. A unit level employer follow-up study is conducted annually. Program results from the unit study are shared with all faculty. The Graduate Program Committee also reviews the results of these studies for possible program implications.

External Agency Evaluation. The Educational Specialist Program is subject to a number of external agency evaluations. All programs are subject to review by the Higher Education Policy commission every five years. All licensure programs must be reviewed and re-filed with the West Virginia Board of Education every five years. The unit is also subject to reviews by the North Central Association and NCATE. Annual evaluation reports are required by the West Virginia Board of Education and NCATE.

Faculty Merit Review. Funds are made available annually for distribution as merit pay to selected faculty. Faculty is recommended for merit pay by a faculty committee or the dean.

Graduate Follow-Up Studies. Graduate follow-up studies are conducted at the program and institutional levels. The results from these surveys are compiled and made available to all internal and external policy and advisory groups and to faculty within the program. Program faculty reviews this data for any possible program implications.

Internal MU Program Review. All unit programs are subject to an internal program review every five years.

Peer Evaluation. All probationary faculties are required to undergo formal peer observation during their probationary period. This process involves completion of a formal observation instrument, which becomes a part of their faculty file.

Performance Assessment. All students completing licensure programs in West Virginia must successfully complete a performance assessment prior to being recommended for licensure. These performance assessments are administered as part of the clinical or field-based experience and are retained as part of the students' permanent file.

Program Faculty Review. Program faculty periodically undertake reviews of individual programs or parts of programs. These studies often result in recommendations for program modification that are acted on by the Graduate Program Committee, Graduate Council or the West Virginia Department of Education if it is a change in a licensure program.

Student Evaluation of Faculty. Institutional policy requires that students evaluate all courses. These data serve as a data source for faculty, course and program evaluation.

Comprehensive Assessment. All programs administer some form of comprehensive assessment for students seeking a degree. Data from these examinations provide a measure of student performance as well as a source of data for program evaluation and change.

Entrance Assessment. All students must meet established test score standards (GRE/MAT) and UGPA requirements for admissions.

Exit Review. All program completers are subject to a multi-level review at the time of program completion.

Graduate Program Committee/Graduate Council Review. All program/course changes are subject to review and approval by the Graduate Program Committee/Graduate Council.

Master Syllabi. All courses are required to have a master syllabus which is used by faculty to develop personal teaching syllabi. This approach helps ensure an objective-based course and consistency of purpose regardless of which member of the faculty is the instructor.

The assessments of each of the learner outcomes is discussed in the attached chart. An analysis of the available data suggests that graduates of the EdS Program in Education are, in general, meeting program standards and expectations.

II. PLANS FOR 2002-2003

As stated in the program goals, plans for the coming year continue to be:

1. Continue to revise and refine program areas of emphasis;
2. Develop a common core of courses that will support more than one area of emphasis;
3. Develop new areas of emphasis in Instructional Technology, Special Education, etc.;
4. Continue to develop/refine assessment plan;
5. Prepare program for NCATE review in Fall 2002; and
6. Develop expanded database to support program planning and management.
7. Expand program marketing efforts

III. ASSISTANCE NEEDED

The revised curriculum will be submitted for approval by the appropriate university committees.

IV. PROGRAM LEARNING

The review and assessment of the program has illustrated the need to develop a common core of classes in order to maximize faculty resources and to continue to provide effective and meaningful instruction.

CONCLUSION

The EdS in Education provides post-master's study for education students and professionals wishing to pursue education beyond the master's level for intellectual curiosity and advanced salary classification within the public education sector. The program is individually designed to accommodate the student's personal and professional goals. This program is accredited, as are all programs in the College of Education, by NCATE.

There are no resident faculty for this program. All faculty are full-time, tenured or tenure-track faculty in the program in which a particular area of emphasis is available. The faculty are active scholars in their particular discipline.

The assessment plan was formally completed during the 2000 academic year and was revised and updated in the 2001 academic year. Current data collection indicates that the program goals are being met. As information becomes available, further changes in the program may be indicated.

Interest in the program is strong with 119 applicants and 104 admitted students in the past four years. In the past 4 years, 58 students have graduated from the program. Enrollment in courses tends to remain stable with a slight improvement over the past two years. The need for persons with advanced degrees remains strong and should continue to do so for the next few years.

Graduate and employer satisfaction remains high. Most students enrolled in the program are professionals in education and thus are an ongoing source of information for program input.

Marshall University
Assessment of Student Outcomes: Component/Course/Program Level

Component Area/Program/Discipline: EdS Education Specialist

Date: December 1, 2002

Component / Course / Program Level					
Student Outcome	Person or Office Responsible	Assessment Tool or Approach	Standards/Benchmark	Results/Analysis	Action Taken
1. Think critically, logically, and creatively about the areas of specialized study	Program director or division head	Program of Studies Final Research Project Comprehensive Exam	All program candidates complete a coherent POS; all successfully complete the Final Research Project; all complete comprehensive assessments; all candidates for certification pass the Praxis	100% POS	Program directors are studying a field based research project
				100% Research Completion 100% Comprehensive Completion Over 95% Pass Praxis	

2. Communicate, both orally and in writing with a high degree of clarity and sophistication with regard to intent, audience, and style	Program director or division head	Course work Research Course Comprehensive Examinations	Final course grades; all program completers successfully complete the Final Research Project; all complete comprehensive assessment	Objective met	None
3. Critically assess the relationship between theory and practice in a selected area of emphasis	Program director or division head	Field Experience/ Internships	All program completers successfully complete field experience/internship	Objective met	Program directors are studying ways to improve the field experience/internship
4. Contextualize their areas of emphasis in terms of historical, economic, social, and political trends	Program director or division head	Plan of Study	Completed POS; all completers maintain 3.0 GPA	Objective met	

<p>5. Engage routinely in inquiry that is systematic, attends to relevant theory, and has practical ramifications</p>	<p>Program director or division head</p>	<p>Research Course Internship</p>	<p>All program completers demonstrate research competencies; all program completers successfully complete a field based internship</p>	<p>Objective met</p>	<p>Program directors are studying ways to better link research and field experience</p>
---	--	-----------------------------------	--	----------------------	---